

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D.C.  
20052

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON  
APRIL 8, 1983, IN LISNER  
HALL, ROOM 603

---

- 1 The meeting was called to order at 2:13 p.m. by Professor John A. Morgan, Jr., Chairman of the Executive Committee, who presided in the absence of President Elliott and Provost Bright.

Present: Registrar Grimm, Burns, Claeysens, Eldridge, Elgart, Frey, Greene, Griffith, Gross, Helgert, Herber, Kramer, Levy, Liebowitz, Mazzeo, Morgan, Park, Robinson, Schiff, B. Smith, G. Smith, H. Solomon, L. Solomon, Steiner, Stewart, and Ziolkowski

Absent: President Elliott, Provost Bright, Parliamentarian Cheh, Barron, Birnbaum, Castleberry, Chandler, Kelly, Linton, Loeser, Sachlis, and Sapin

- 2 The minutes of the regular meeting of March 11, 1983, were approved as distributed.

Professor Morgan asked that the order of the agenda be changed so that Item 5, General Business, could be taken up before Item 3, Resolutions, if there were no objections. No objections were made.

- 5 (a) On behalf of the Nominating Committee for the Executive Committee for the 1983-84 Session, Professor Kramer, Chairman, moved the nomination of Professor John A. Morgan, Jr., School of Public and International Affairs, for election as Chairman of the Executive Committee for the 1983-84 Session. No nominations were made from the floor, and Professor Morgan was elected unanimously as Chairman. Proceeding with the election of the four additional members of the Executive Committee, Professor Kramer explained that the Nominating Committee was unable to narrow its nominations down to four; therefore, the committee proposed the following slate of six nominees: Associate Professor Sherwin Greene (SGBA), Professor Hermann J. Helgert (SEAS), Professor Norman C. Kramer (Medical), Professor Robert E. Park (Law), Professor Stefan O. Schiff (Columbia College) and Professor George W. Smith (Education). Professor Morgan asked if there were any nominations from the floor. Professor Solomon nominated Professor Lilien F. Robinson for election to the Executive Committee. Professor Robinson declined the nomination. No other nominations were made. The Chair instructed the membership to vote for no more than four from the list of six. Ballots were distributed, marked, returned, and counted. Four nominees received the necessary majority of 12 or more votes: Park-20, Schiff-20, Kramer-17, and Greene-13. The Chair declared Professors Park, Schiff, Kramer, and Greene elected to membership on the Executive Committee for the 1983-84 Session.

- 5 (b) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Morgan nominated the following faculty members for election to the Grievance Committee for a three-year term commencing May 1, 1983: Yousef Al-Doory, Associate Professor of Pathology; Janet C. Heddeshimer, Professor of Education; Peter P. Hill, Professor of History; and Robert L. Holland, Associate Professor of Business Administration. No nominations were made from the floor and the nominees were elected unanimously. Professor Morgan noted that one additional nomination would have to be made, but up to this time he had been unsuccessful in his attempt to have the name of a nominee from the law faculty for election at today's meeting. On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Morgan then nominated Victor H. Cohn, Jr., Professor of Pharmacology, for re-election as Chairman of the Grievance Committee. No nominations were made from the floor, and Professor Cohn was re-elected unanimously.

(c) On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Morgan moved the following nominations for appointment by the President to Administrative Committees:  
Judicial System: Lewis A. Schiller (Chairman), William J. Briscoe, Pamela Finnerty-Fried, Carol H. Hoare, and Charles C. Shepherd, Jr.;  
Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals: Maximilian A. Pock (Chairman), Marvin S. Katzman, W. Douglas Maurer, and Garland D. Wiggs;  
Marvin Center Program Board: David McAleavey;  
Marvin Center Governing Board: James L. Breen, Joseph A. Greenberg, Marilyn Liebreinz, and Charles E. O'Rear;  
Presidential Appeals Board: Joseph Aschheim, Eldor O. Pederson, Roger E. Schechter, and Jarrett M. Wise. No additional nominations were made and the nominees were elected unanimously.

(d) In the report of the Executive Committee Professor Morgan called attention to the change in date of the next Executive Committee meeting, now scheduled for Monday, April 18th, instead of Friday, April 22nd. He also noted that the next meeting of the Faculty Senate was Friday, May 6th, which marked the beginning of the new session for 1983-84. With regard to the Senate's Special Committee on Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty Members, he said that Professor Reich, Chairman, had informed him that the Special Committee expected to have its report to the Executive Committee in time for the May Senate meeting.

(e) Professor Eldridge, Chairman of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, reported that the committee would be meeting April 13th and the question under discussion would be what contingency plans were in place or were being developed in the event of a shortfall in tuition income. While he hoped this event would not come to pass, Professor Eldridge said the committee thought this question should be explored, and he said if anyone had any suggestions to make, he would be glad to pass them on to the committee.

Professor Steiner, Chairman of the Physical Facilities Committee, reported that the committee held a lengthy discussion about the policy on campus building retention and passed the following two motions: "That the University create a program to mark appropriately those buildings on campus that are regarded as part of the University's heritage" (Red Lion Row Houses, Ray House, and Lenthal Houses) and "That a subcommittee of the Physical Facilities Committee be formed to organize the University program on buildings on campus regarded as part of the University's heritage."

(f) No annual reports were received. Professor Morgan reminded chairmen that annual reports were due on or before the May 6th Senate meeting.

- 3 (a) On behalf of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, Professor Griffith, Chairman, moved the adoption of Resolution 82/8, "A Resolution Concerning Part-Time Faculty," and the motion was seconded. Professor Griffith said that the committee was concerned about the impact on the professional status

of faculty employed only as part-timers and the treatment afforded them, especially where part-time faculty were teaching two and sometimes three courses on part-time individual course stipends. He said it was not the intention of the committee to eliminate part-time appointments at GW, but rather to suggest that every department or instructional unit that utilizes part-time faculty have a carefully developed policy so that part-time appointments are used to supplement the instructional efforts of full-time faculty and not used to gradually replace full-time appointments in a way that would be adverse to the role of full-time faculty. He then asked the floor for Professor R. Emmet Kennedy, Chairman of the subcommittee which developed the Report. Professor Kennedy said that from the committee's point of view there seemed to be an ethical issue involved when Ph.D's, who were highly-trained at good graduate schools could not get full-time academic positions for which they were trained, and part-timers could come in from elsewhere and take their places. Over the past ten years, he said, the ratio of part-time to full-time faculty has increased from 35% to about 49%, excluding the Medical School, and it seemed to the committee that this practice should stop, given the potential risk of losing the University's full-time faculty status. Professor Frey said he supported the resolution, but was concerned about whether it would be implemented immediately. Professor Schiff, on behalf of the Department of Journalism, read the following statement:

The figures cited in the Special Report of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee of the University Senate on part-time teaching are not necessarily as damning as they may seem at first glance. More than 2/3 of our part-time faculty teach in Medicine, an area traditionally heavy in part-time positions. But beyond that, the utility-- for students as well as the University-- of using part-time faculty is significantly different for an institution located in this city than it may be for institutions located elsewhere.

For the Journalism Department, for example, not to take advantage of the talent available to it on a part-time basis would be to deprive our students of teachers and experiences we could not provide with full-time faculty. Replacing our part-time staff from The Washington Post, NBC, The National Geographic, etc.-- who day-by-day do for their employers what they are teaching our undergraduates to do-- would, at the very least, mean an across the board reduction in the quality of instruction.

Professor Schiff then asked Professor Griffith what was meant by the phrase, "when there are specific countervailing reasons guided by established criteria," appearing in the second RESOLVING clause of the resolution. Professor Griffith explained that a "countervailing reason" would be, for example, the reason mentioned in the statement of the Journalism Department where there are highly-specialized courses and there is a net advantage to the University to go outside of the regular faculty to employ part-time faculty to teach these courses. Insofar as "established criteria" are concerned, Professor Griffith said this question has to do with who actually decides who shall teach part-time, who shall be hired, and so on. Some departments and schools do have carefully defined policies, or criteria, under which part-time appointments will be handled, and it seemed to the committee that that should be the rule, rather than the exception. Dean Liebowitz explained that the School of Engineering and Applied Science depended very heavily on part-time faculty for both financial and academic

considerations. He said if SEAS could not employ part-time faculty it would cost the school about 1.4 million dollars; on the academic side, it would lower the standards of the school's curriculum because the school would be unable to draw upon the talents of a high concentration of experts in the Washington area who are willing to teach part-time, but not full-time, in specialized fields, such as Computer Science, Operations Research, etc. Dean Liebowitz said he thought the University has to be realistic and, therefore, he would have to speak strongly against the resolution.

Professor Elgart and Professor Kramer pointed out that most of the part-time faculty in the Medical Center were volunteer faculty who represented no financial liability for the University and contributed significantly to their educational programs, and that the percentages of part-time faculty in the Medical Center as reflected in the report were very misleading. Professor Griffith responded that the intent of the resolution was not to eliminate voluntary contributions by medical professionals but merely to recommend that the instructional units have clear policies and good justification for using part-time faculty because this practice could be costly to the University in various ways. Dean Solomon then read the following statement:

The utilization of part-time faculty is an important subject for attention within our academic community. Without question it receives continuing attention by chairman and deans in addition to the Faculty Senate. On April 9, 1982, the Educational Policy Committee distributed its report on the subject to the Faculty Senate. The Committee concluded that major changes in present policy are not warranted insofar as the policy relates to academic standards. Certainly in the future there must continue to be academic oversight on the matter.

Reasons for the resolution to be presented to the Senate on April 8, 1983 appear to be (1) the presence of an extraordinarily large number of part-time faculty relative to full-time faculty and (2) an assertion that academic freedom is necessarily compromised when many of its members are part-time faculty.

Data should be utilized to illustrate or document or assist in resolving a problem in a proper fashion. Instead the Committee furnished data which are so poorly classified and highly aggregated as to misrepresent the situation. For example, the part-time appointments in the Medical School, and say, the Economics Department are sufficiently different in purpose and utilization to preclude equivalence. Also the comparative analyses are doubtful. To give only one example of this, resort should be made to comparing the use of part-time faculty by institutions in major metropolitan areas. Of course institutions in smaller urban areas and rural areas make less use of part-time faculty; the supply scarcely exists.

It must be clear that part-time faculty in the Graduate School are not utilized to teach freshman courses. Rather they are individuals with unique expertise who bring distinctiveness and distinction to many of our programs. In addition to offering excellence in the classroom, there is no doubt that over the years many of our best dissertations have been supervised by part-time faculty.

Let us now move away from the numbers and address the major substantive issue raised by the Committee, i.e., academic freedom. If the Committee or anyone else has evidence of instances where academic freedom has been violated or compromised this should be made known and the University should act decisively in these cases. The assertion by the Committee that academic freedom is necessarily compromised by the use of part-time faculty is not supported and is at best ambiguous.

Further discussion followed by Professors Kirsch, Morgan, Ziolkowski, Schiff, Mazzeo, Kennedy, Claeysens, Gross, Deans Liebowitz and Solomon. Professor Park distributed copies of the results of a recent survey he made of the attitudes of 102 law students, all of whom had been taught by part-time faculty for one or more courses, toward the use of part-time faculty. The results showed a positive response toward the use of part-time faculty in the Law Center; obviously, Professor Park said, he did not know how the students in the other schools or colleges viewed the matter. With regard to the resolution itself, Professor Park said he would vote against it because it appeared to address what may be a problem in Columbian College or in a particular department, but not the University as a whole.

Discussion followed by Professors Ziolkowski, Levy, Stewart, Griffith, Frey, Steiner, Morgan, Schiff, Provost Johnson, and Dean Solomon. Professor Morgan said he thought that on occasion there may be misuse of part-time as opposed to full-time faculty members which was the major concern of the Professional Ethics Committee; however, he was not at all certain it was appropriate for the Faculty Senate to consider a specialized problem occurring in one or two schools. Professor Eldridge commented that it seemed to him that the Faculty Senate should be looking for ways to publicize, rather than defend, the real strength that the University gains from its part-time faculty. The question was called and Resolution 82/8 was defeated. (Resolution 82/8 attached.)

- 3 (b) On behalf of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, Professor Robinson moved the adoption of Resolution 82/9, "A Resolution to Amend the Faculty Code to Include a Statement on Criteria for Tenure," and the motion was seconded. Professor Robinson said the committee was offering this as a substitute resolution for Resolution 81/11 which was referred by the Faculty Senate March 12, 1982, to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee. She said that the committee strongly supported the need to address the issue of tenure in the Faculty Code and thought that there should be a separation of consideration for granting tenure and for that of promotion. Therefore, she said, the committee proposed some general guidelines for awarding tenure as a basic structure for all schools and departments of the University. The criteria relate to the total faculty performance and the programmatic needs of the University, and she emphasized that more specific criteria appropriate to each school or department could be added to these very general ones. Also, the committee thought that the faculty must be given information on the procedures which are followed for making tenure decisions and that such procedures should be published and made available as a matter of instruction to the faculty.

Professor Kirsch, a member of the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee, said that the main difference in the substitute resolution from the original resolution was the inclusion of "programmatic needs of the University" in the criteria. He said that both committees met to discuss this matter, but were unable to agree on this point. The ASPP Committee felt very strongly that programmatic needs of the University must be included in the criteria for tenure. Professor Griffith, commenting on behalf of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, said that the committee acknowledged the appropriateness of considering programmatic needs of the University, but the committee's concern was that the Faculty Code now unequivocally states that an individual shall be considered solely on his or her merit and it was not clear how that would be compatible with an additional provision for taking into account programmatic needs. He said the committee suggested that if programmatic needs are to be considered, then they ought to be separate and apart from consideration of the individual, and language could be inserted elsewhere in the Faculty Code relating to programmatic needs. The committee also thought it was an impermissible burden on the individual to have to make a formal request to determine what his or her probable status was with regard to tenure. Since the Faculty Code

presently requires that departments inform faculty members of their progress toward promotion, the same procedure ought to be followed for tenure status. Professor Kirsch replied that the committee thought the burden should be placed on the faculty member to initiate the review because a department chairman might forget to inform the individual and that might result in a potential lawsuit against the University.

Dean Liebowitz commented that he thought the inclusion of programmatic needs as part of criteria for awarding tenure should be seriously considered prior to approving tenure-track positions for each school and college rather than after the appointments are made. Professor Park said that he agreed with Professor Griffith that it was the University's obligation to counsel faculty members on their professional development and, therefore, he would suggest amending the substitute resolution to excise the language "upon his request" which appears in the third RESOLVING clause. Professor Morgan pointed out that amendments to the substitute resolution were out of order at this point; consideration of amending the original resolution should be concluded before proceeding to amend the substitute resolution. Professor Park then said he wished to make a second point and that concerned the impending Report of the Special Committee on Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty Members which he thought would have a direct bearing on the resolution before the Senate. This report, he understood, would contain recommendations to change the present categories of classifying faculty to include a pool of "tenure eligibles" with the contemplation that programmatic considerations would influence how many tenure appointment opportunities would be open. Further discussion followed by Professors Levy, Robinson, Schiff, Griffith, and Provost Phelps. In view of Professor Park's comments about the impending Report of the Special Committee on Non-Tenure-Accruing Faculty Members, Professor Gross moved to postpone the resolution until the Faculty Senate takes action on this Report. The motion to postpone was seconded and passed. (Resolution 82/9 attached.)

4           No resolutions were introduced under Introduction of Resolutions.

6           Under Brief Statements, Professor Morgan, noting that this was the last meeting of the current session, thanked the outgoing members of the Faculty Senate on behalf of the Executive Committee.

7           Upon motion made and seconded, Professor Morgan adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.



Theodore H. Grimm, Jr.  
Secretary

## A RESOLUTION CONCERNING PART-TIME FACULTY (82/8 )

WHEREAS, the proportion of part-time faculty to total faculty at The George Washington University is double the estimated national average in higher education and triple the latest average for research institutions;

WHEREAS, there are currently more than twice as many part-time faculty as full-time faculty at The George Washington University;

WHEREAS, the policy of hiring large numbers of part-time faculty in lieu of full-time faculty in disciplines where there are numerous qualified individuals seeking full-time employment deprives these individuals of the possibility of exercising a profession for which they were trained and deprives the University of the full-time commitment of a large percentage of its faculty;

WHEREAS, the academic freedom of the faculty as a whole is necessarily compromised when many of its members are deprived of basic faculty rights such as tenure and participation in the governance of the University; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That it shall be an objective of this University

- (1) to replace part-time faculty appointments with full-time faculty appointments except when there are specific countervailing reasons guided by established criteria;
- (2) to proportion the salary of part-time faculty to that of full-time faculty whenever the teaching load of a part-time faculty member exceeds six (6) credit-hours per semester.

March 1983

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

Defeated, April 8, 1983

(Substitute Resolution for Resolution 81/11 referred by the Faculty Senate  
March 12, 1982, to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee)

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO INCLUDE  
A STATEMENT ON CRITERIA FOR TENURE (82/9)

WHEREAS, there are general criteria for promotion in the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, the schools of this University have both different criteria for  
awarding tenure and different degrees of specificity in their  
criteria; and

WHEREAS, some guidelines for awarding tenure would be desirable and  
appropriate in the Faculty Code; THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) that the University recognize the fact that different schools  
have different criteria, and this recognition be explicated by  
inserting new Paragraph IV-C in the Faculty Code (and relettering  
present C as D):

IV-C TENURE

1. Tenure shall be dependent upon professional competence as evidenced  
by teaching ability, productive scholarship, participation and leadership  
in professional societies, service to the University, public service, and  
programmatic needs of the University.

2. Each school, college or comparable educational division shall establish  
and publish criteria on which the granting of tenure will be based. Such  
criteria shall be stated separately from the criteria for promotion. Any  
additional criteria for tenure that may exist in departments shall also be  
published. Each department or nondepartmentalized school or college shall  
establish and publish the procedures followed for making decisions concerning  
tenure.

3. To aid faculty members in assessing their potential for achieving tenure,  
each department, division, or comparable program shall establish procedures for  
informing the faculty member, upon his request, concerning his probable status  
with regard to tenure. Such information will not constitute a commitment to  
recommend tenure.

March 21, 1983  
Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies  
(including Fringe Benefits)

April 8, 1983  
Postponed until Senate action on  
the Report on Non-Tenure-Accruing  
Faculty Members



THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY  
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

March 28, 1983

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, April 8, 1983, at 2:10 p.m., in  
Lisner Hall, Room 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Minutes of the regular meeting of March 11, 1983
3. Resolutions:
  - (a) A RESOLUTION CONCERNING PART-TIME FACULTY (82/8) with accompanying Report; Professor William B. Griffith, Chairman, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee (resolution and report attached)
  - (b) A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO INCLUDE A STATEMENT ON CRITERIA FOR TENURE (82/9); substitute resolution for Resolution 81/11 referred by the Faculty Senate March 12, 1982; Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman, Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee (Substitute Resolution 82/9 and Resolution 81/11 attached)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. General Business:
  - (a) Nomination for election of the Executive Committee for the 1983-84 Session: Report of the Nominating Committee; Professor Norman C. Kramer, Chairman
  - (b) Nomination for election of the following faculty members to the Grievance Committee for a three-year term commencing May 1, 1983: Yousef Al-Doory, Associate Professor of Pathology; Janet C. Heddesheimer, Professor of Education; Peter P. Hill, Professor of History; and Robert L. Holland, Associate Professor of Management Science; nomination for re-election of Professor Victor H. Cohn, Jr., Professor of Pharmacology, as Chairman

5. General Business (continued)

- (c) Nomination for appointment by the President to the following Administrative Committees: Judicial System: Lewis A. Schiller (Chairman), William J. Briscoe, Pamela Finnerty-Fried, Carol H. Hoare, and Charles C. Shepherd, Jr.; Student-Faculty Committee on Appeals: Maximilian A. Pock (Chairman), Marvin S. Katzman, W. Douglas Maurer, and Garland D. Wiggs; Marvin Center Program Board: David McAleavey; Marvin Center Governing Board: James L. Breen, Joseph A. Greenberg, Marilyn Liebrez, and Charles E. O'Rear; Presidential Appeals Board: Joseph Aschheim, Eldor O. Pederson, Roger E. Schechter, and Jarrett M. Wise
- (d) Report of the Executive Committee: John A. Morgan, Jr., Chairman
- (e) Interim Reports of Senate Standing Committees
- (f) Annual Reports of Senate Standing Committees (due on or before May Senate meeting)

6. Brief Statements

7. Adjournment



Theodore H. Grimm, Jr.  
Secretary

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING PART-TIME FACULTY (82/8 )

WHEREAS, the proportion of part-time faculty to total faculty at The George Washington University is double the estimated national average in higher education and triple the latest average for research institutions;

WHEREAS, there are currently more than twice as many part-time faculty as full-time faculty at The George Washington University;

WHEREAS, the policy of hiring large numbers of part-time faculty in lieu of full-time faculty in disciplines where there are numerous qualified individuals seeking full-time employment deprives these individuals of the possibility of exercising a profession for which they were trained and deprives the University of the full-time commitment of a large percentage of its faculty;

WHEREAS, the academic freedom of the faculty as a whole is necessarily compromised when many of its members are deprived of basic faculty rights such as tenure and participation in the governance of the University; NOW, THEREFORE,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

That it shall be an objective of this University

- (1) to replace part-time faculty appointments with full-time faculty appointments except when there are specific countervailing reasons guided by established criteria;
- (2) to proportion the salary of part-time faculty to that of full-time faculty whenever the teaching load of a part-time faculty member exceeds six (6) credit-hours per semester.

March 1983

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

Special Report of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee  
of the Faculty Senate

---

REPORT ON THE NUMBERS OF PART-TIME FACULTY AT GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

A computer print-out from the Provost's office provides the following information about the extent of part-time faculty at the George Washington University as of September 1982. The total number of the faculty is 3106 of which 1900 are part-time and 895 full-time. The following graph breaks down the total by division of the University.

<u>School</u>	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>% P.T.</u>
Columbian College	301	276	577	47.8
Education	56	57	113	50.4
Engin & Applied	78	106	184	57.6
Govt & Bus Adm	95	62	157	39.4
Grad Sch of Art	10	26	36	72.2
Medicine (Affil:311)	287	1309	1907	68.6
National Law Cen	49	56	105	53.3
Pub & Int Aff	19	8	27	29.6
TOTAL	895	1900	3106	61

The National Center for Education Statistics estimates that 220,000 of 690,000 faculty members in higher education are part-time in 1981-82 or 31.8%. The level obtaining at George Washington University is 61%. A report by David W. Leslie and Ronald B. Head in Educational Record, 60 (1979), 46-47 asserts that "Among the major research universities, comprehensive regional universities and liberal art colleges, one fifth to one quarter of all faculty members work part-time.... The National Science Foundation reports that approximately 20 percent of all faculty members in the social, physical biological, and mathematical sciences and in the applied fields of medicine and engineering are part-timers." If one were to exclude the Medical School, whose ratio of part-time to full-time faculty is three times the levels found by NSF in 1979, the overall level of the University drops to 49.3% as opposed to 31.8% nationally. While this data does not address itself to the question of the number of courses taught by part-timers as opposed to full-timers, the Provost's data shows that significant numbers of part-timers teach more than one course (29% of Columbian College part-timers teach two or more courses, 33% of the School of Education part-timers teach two or more courses, but only 6.5% Columbian College part-timers and 6.6% part-timers in the School of Education teach three or more courses -- the category affected by 1b) of the Resolution attached.

The disadvantages of heavy reliance on part-time faculty have been stressed in many publications of AAUP. The following is an excerpt from a "Statement on Part-Time Faculty" by the Modern Languages Association in its Fall 1982 Newletter:

The very conditions under which most temporary and permanent part-time teachers are employed define them as nonprofessionals. Often they are hired quickly, as last-minute replacements, with only hasty review of their credentials. They receive little recognition or respect for their contributions to their departments; in many instances they are paid inequitably.

The potential damage to academic programs caused by the excessive use of part-time teachers cannot be calculated exactly,

but some negative effects are unavoidable. Because part-time teachers are not treated as members of the departmental community, they often have a limited commitment to the institution and its students. Because part-time teachers rarely participate, as professionals should, in the development of courses, the continuity of sequential courses and the consistency of multi-sectioned courses suffer. Because part-time teachers are rarely available to advise students or, if available, may not be fully informed about institutional programs, inordinately heavy responsibility for advising falls to the full-time faculty. In addition, because of the low professional standing of part-time teachers, their frequent assignment to composition and introductory language courses diminishes the importance of basic courses at a time when society recognizes a need for special attention to this part of the curriculum.

In face of present conditions and concern about the decline in quality of humanities programs, the MLA urges college and university administrations to make new and concerted efforts to eliminate the excessive use of part-time teachers, to improve the conditions under which part-time teachers are employed, and to recognize the professional status and important contributions of such teachers. Continuation of excessive, unplanned use of part-time teachers can only exacerbate administrative difficulties, invite student dissatisfaction, and threaten the quality of education.

In conclusion we must point out that while a majority of the G.W. faculty is part-time, most courses in most divisions of the University are taught by full-timers. Whether this continues to be the case and whether the current levels of part-time instruction can be reduced, depends upon a decisive policy to achieve this goal.

Respectfully submitted,

*Wm B. Griffith*  
William B. Griffith, Chairman  
Professional Ethics and Academic  
Freedom Committee

Members:

Paula R. Kaiser, (Emeritus)  
Robert E. Kennedy, History  
Edward R. Lilly, Education  
Murray H. Loew, EECS  
Benjamin Nimer, Political Science  
Gail Paster, English  
Paul Peyser, Business Administration  
Howard C. Pierpont, Surgery  
David E. Silber, Psychology  
James E. Starrs, Law  
Calvin D. Linton, Dean, ex officio

(Substitute Resolution for Resolution 81/11 referred by the Faculty Senate  
March 12, 1982, to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee)

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO INCLUDE  
A STATEMENT ON CRITERIA FOR TENURE (82/9)

WHEREAS, there are general criteria for promotion in the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, the schools of this University have both different criteria for  
awarding tenure and different degrees of specificity in their  
criteria; and

WHEREAS, some guidelines for awarding tenure would be desirable and  
appropriate in the Faculty Code; THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) that the University recognize the fact that different schools  
have different criteria, and this recognition be explicated by  
inserting new Paragraph IV-C in the Faculty Code (and relettering  
present C as D):

IV-C TENURE

1. Tenure shall be dependent upon professional competence as evidenced  
by teaching ability, productive scholarship, participation and leadership  
in professional societies, service to the University, public service, and  
programmatic needs of the University.
2. Each school, college or comparable educational division shall establish  
and publish criteria on which the granting of tenure will be based. Such  
criteria shall be stated separately from the criteria for promotion. Any  
additional criteria for tenure that may exist in departments shall also be  
published. Each department or nondepartmentalized school or college shall  
establish and publish the procedures followed for making decisions concerning  
tenure.
3. To aid faculty members in assessing their potential for achieving tenure,  
each department, division, or comparable program shall establish procedures for  
informing the faculty member, upon his request, concerning his probable status  
with regard to tenure. Such information will not constitute a commitment to  
recommend tenure.

March 21, 1983  
Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies  
(including Fringe Benefits)

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FACULTY CODE TO INCLUDE  
A STATEMENT ON CRITERIA FOR TENURE (81/11)

WHEREAS, there are general criteria for promotion in the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, the schools of this University have both different criteria for awarding tenure and different degrees of specificity in their criteria; and

WHEREAS, some guidelines for awarding tenure would be desirable and appropriate in the Faculty Code, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

- (1) that the University recognize the fact that different schools have different criteria, and this recognition be explicated by inserting new Paragraph IV-C in the Faculty Code (and relettering present C as D):

IV-C. Tenure.

1. Each school, college, or comparable educational division shall establish and publish criteria on which the decision to award tenure is based. If individual departments maintain additional criteria, these will be published also.
2. Each department, division or comparable program shall establish procedures for informing faculty members periodically concerning their probable status with regard to tenure; such information will not constitute a commitment to recommend tenure, but shall aim to aid faculty members in assessing their potential for achieving tenure.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom  
February 26, 1982

March 12, 1982, referred to the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee